

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

GETTY IMAGES (US), INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 23-135 (JLH)
)	
STABILITY AI, LTD. and STABILITY)	
AI, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.		

**PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Getty Images (US), Inc. (“Getty Images”), through its undersigned counsel, hereby requests leave to file the Second Amended Complaint, as provided by Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. A copy of the Second Amended Complaint is annexed as Exhibit A. A copy of a redline that tracks the changes to the Amended Complaint is annexed as Exhibit B. Defendants do not oppose this request.

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Over a year ago, on February 3, 2023, Getty Images brought claims against Stability AI, Inc., a Delaware corporation, to redress harm caused by the unauthorized copying of some 12 million images and the associated captions and metadata from Getty Images’ websites to train a generative AI model; the provision of outputs that either infringed works on which the model was trained, contained false copyright management information, or both; infringing and diluting uses of Getty Images’ trademarks; and deceptive trade practices. D.I. 1. On March 29, 2023, Getty Images filed an Amended Complaint that, *inter alia*, named Stability AI, Ltd. (together with Stability AI, Inc., “Defendants”) as an additional defendant. D.I. 13.

On May 2, 2023, Defendants moved to dismiss or transfer this action to the Northern District of California. D.I. 16. Defendants conceded that Stability AI, Inc. is subject to personal jurisdiction in Delaware and that Stability AI, Ltd., a UK corporation, is subject to personal jurisdiction in the United States, but they contended that Stability AI, Ltd. is a necessary and indispensable party that is not subject to personal jurisdiction in Delaware. D.I. 17. The parties submitted a stipulation and proposed order concerning jurisdictional discovery on June 7, 2023, D.I. 21, and on January 26, 2024, the Court dismissed the Defendants' motion to dismiss or transfer without prejudice to re-file after the conclusion of jurisdictional discovery. D.I. 36. With the exception of two narrow categories that remain the subject of a pending discovery dispute (*see* D.I. 32, 33), jurisdictional discovery has been substantially completed.

Getty Images now seeks to file a Second Amended Complaint that includes additional allegations relating to personal jurisdiction, as well as other changes to reflect developments and new information learned since the filing of the Amended Complaint and the inclusion of Stability AI US Services Corporation, a Delaware corporation that was formed in March 2023, as an additional defendant.

Defendants do not oppose the filing of the Second Amended Complaint, but reserve the right to challenge the proposed Second Amended Complaint on all grounds.

II. ARGUMENT

After a party has amended a pleading once as a matter of course, further amendments require consent of the adverse party or leave of the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). Leave to amend a complaint prior to trial is to be given freely when justice requires. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). Amendment should ordinarily be permitted absent a showing of "undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendment previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of the allowance of the amendment,

futility of the amendment, etc.” *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962). The Third Circuit has “shown a strong liberality in allowing amendments” to “ensure[] that a particular claim will be decided on its merits rather than on technicalities.” *Dole v. Arco Chemical Co.*, 921 F.2d 484, 487 (3d Cir. 1990).

In this case, Plaintiff seeks to amend its complaint to add, *inter alia*, allegations learned through jurisdictional discovery that Stability AI, Inc. and Stability AI, Ltd. operate as a group and are alter egos of one another, as well as to address relevant developments since the filing of the Amended Complaint. Plaintiff also seeks to add Stability AI US Services Corporation as a defendant. As described below, justice is served because consideration of the factors weighs in favor of amendment.

A. Amendment Is Timely.

Plaintiff’s motion for leave to amend is timely. There is no scheduling order in place in this matter. There are no pending motions and no deadlines that will be affected by permitting amendment. Indeed, through the proposed amendment, Plaintiff directly addresses issues raised by Defendants in their since-dismissed motion to dismiss or transfer, which, if Defendants nonetheless elect to re-file a motion to dismiss, will make resolution of that motion more efficient. Simply put, this action remains at the outset with respect to resolution on the merits of Getty Images’ claims.

B. There Has Not Been Undue Delay.

Getty Images has not unduly delayed filing its motion for leave to amend. The motion seeking leave to amend is in direct response to the issues addressed in jurisdictional discovery. And, as noted above, there is no scheduling order in place in this matter, and there are no other deadlines that would be affected by permitting amendment. *See NHB Assignments LLC on behalf of Liquidating Tr. v. Gen. Atl. LLC*, No. CV 12-1020-SLR, 2013 WL 4630022, at *3 (D. Del. Aug.

29, 2013) (granting motion for leave to amend and finding no undue delay where no scheduling order had been entered and no discovery had taken place except that related to diversity jurisdiction).

C. Amendment Is Not Prejudicial.

The Third Circuit has made clear that it is the opposing party's burden to demonstrate undue prejudice. *Dole*, 921 F.2d at 488 (quoting *Heyl & Patterson Int'l, Inc. v. F.D. Rich Housing of the Virgin Islands Inc.*, 663 F.2d 419, 426 (3d Cir.1981)). Here, Defendants do not oppose the filing of the proposed Second Amended Complaint.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Getty Images respectfully requests that the Court grant the unopposed motion for leave to file the proposed Second Amended Complaint.

Dated: July 2, 2024

OF COUNSEL:

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT &
TAYLOR, LLP

Benjamin E. Marks
Jared R. Friedmann
Melissa Rutman
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153
(212) 310-8000
benjamin.marks@weil.com
jared.friedmann@weil.com
melissa.rutman@weil.com

/s/ Tammy L. Mercer
Tammy L. Mercer (No. 4957)
Robert M. Vrana (No. 5666)
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 571-6600
tmerc@ycst.com
rvrana@ycst.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Getty Images (US), Inc

Brian G. Liegel
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
1395 Brickell Ave, Ste. 1200
Miami, Florida 33131
(305) 577-3180
brian.liegel@weil.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on July 2, 2024, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the counsel listed below in the manner indicated:

BY E-MAIL

Jack B. Blumenfeld
Michael J. Flynn
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT
& TUNNELL LLP
1201 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19899
jblumenfeld@morrisnichols.com
mflynn@morrisnichols.com

Attorneys for Defendants

Joseph C. Gratz
Timothy Chen Saulsbury
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
jgratz@mofo.com
tsaulsbury@mofo.com

Allyson R. Bennett
Laura Gilbert Remus
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
707 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA, 90017-3543
abennett@mofo.com
LRemus@mofo.com

Aditya V. Kamdar
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2100 L Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, D.C., 20037
(202) 887-1500
akamdar@mofo.com

Dated: July 2, 2024

YOUNG CONAWAY
STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

/s/ Tammy L. Mercer

Tammy L. Mercer (No. 4957)

Robert M. Vrana (No. 5666)

1000 North King Street

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

(302) 571-6600

tmerc@ycst.com

rvrana@ycst.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Getty Images (US), Inc.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

GETTY IMAGES (US), INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 23-135 (JLH)
)	
STABILITY AI, LTD. and STABILITY)	
AI, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

At Wilmington this ____ day of _____, 2024, having considered Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint, and all papers and argument submitted therewith, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is GRANTED.

United States District Judge